DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
HEADQUARTERS, AIRBORNE & RANGER TRAINING BRIGADE
10850 SCHNEIDER ROAD, BLDG 5024
FORT BENNING, GEORGIA 31905-4166

ATSH-RB   03 April 2017

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Ranger School Statistical Analysis for FY16

1. Purpose. To provide statistics and data analysis on student performance in Ranger School to the Army, Sister Services, and International Student populations to improve student preparation for, and performance at, Ranger School.

2. Overall Statistics by for FY16.

    a. Graduation Rates.

        (1) The overall graduation rate from FY16 was 36.8%. 4009 personnel attended the Ranger Course in FY 2016.

FY16		
Total Attend	4009	
Grad	1476	36.8%
Fail	2533	63.2%

Figure 1. FY16 Graduation Rate.

    b. Failure Data.

        (1) The top five failure reasons for FY16 were: 1) Ranger Physical Assessment, 2) Land Navigation, 3) Foot March, 4) Patrols and 5) Medical.

        (2) The Ranger Physical Assessment was the leading cause of the failures in 2016. 24.2% of all attendees (969/4009) failed the RPA. This is slightly worse than the RPA numbers from 2015. In FY15, 22.3% of attendees failed the RPA (862/3870).

        (3) A majority of failures occur during RAP week, which includes the Ranger Physical Assessment (RPA), Combat Water Survival Assessment (CWSA), land navigation, and 12 mile footmarch events. 44.3% of students (1776 personnel) failed in RAP Week. More personnel fail

RAP Week annually than graduate Ranger School. Starting with RC 06-17, RAP week will also include the Ranger Task Training testing.

Reasons for Failure	Total Number	% of All Attendees
RPA	969	24.2%
LN	436	10.9%
FM	327	8.2%
Patrols	239	6.0%
Medical	178	4.4%
LOM	113	2.8%
PP	60	1.5%
PPS	53	1.3%
CWSA	44	1.1%
SOR	32	0.8%
PR	22	0.5%
PS	16	0.4%
Admin	35	0.9%
PRS	6	0.1%
Spots	3	0.1%

(4) The breakdown of reasons for failure are shown in Figure 2. Academic reasons for failure include patrols, spot reports, peer evaluations, or a combination of any of the three. Administrative reasons for failure include medical issues, Special Observation Reports (SORs), Lack of Motivation (LOM) statements, or administrative reasons such as missing paperwork, family issues, or other special circumstances.

Figure 2. Failures by Reason.

c. Recycles.

(1) Of the total number of recycles, 60.1% are due to patrols, which has consistently remained the highest cause over the last several years. In fact, patrols account for more recycles than all other causes combined.

Figure 3. Recycles by Cause.

3. Source Statistics.

a. Units.

(1) The data below breaks down graduation rates for major sources of students. The graduation rates highlighted in green are above the overall graduation rate for FY16 (36.8%).

Figure 4. Grad Rate By Unit

| Unit	Grad Rate	Total Attendees
1st Armored Division	22.9%	35
1st Cavalry Division	37.5%	16
1st Infantry Division	33.3%	30
10th Mountain Division	34.2%	202
101st Airborne Division	28.5%	172
2nd Infantry Division	26.2%	42
25th Infantry Division	30.7%	244
3rd Infantry Division	21.3%	108
4th Infantry Division	28.2%	39
7 ID/ I Corps	27.3%	22
75th Ranger Regiment	56.7%	554
82nd Airborne Division	37.8%	267
173rd	20.7%	140
ABOLC	21.9%	178
IBOLC	40.6%	936
International Students	32.4%	71
MCCC	16.5%	85
National Guard	43.8%	89
Other BOLC	32.5%	80
Other CCC	11.1%	18
Sister Services	42.9%	28
USASOC	49.8%	203
Other Units	28.4%	450

(2) Units with mandatory pre-Ranger courses (PRC) such as the 75th Ranger Regiment, National Guard, and 82nd Airborne Division, tend to have higher graduation rates than other units.

(3) The top sources (those units that send the most Students) include: Infantry Basic Officer Leadership Course (IBOLC), 75th Ranger Regiment, 82nd Airborne Division, 25th Infantry Division, and United States Army Special Operations Command (USASOC).

Figure 5. Total Attendees by Unit.

4. Statistics by Rank and MOS.

    (1) Rank.

        (a) The highest enlisted graduation rate was E3 at 43.1%. The highest officer graduation rate, where more than one officer attended, was O2 at 39.8%. Officers attended at a slightly higher number than enlisted personnel in FY16 (2046 Officers/1963 Enlisted Personnel).

Figure 6. Graduation Rates by Rank.

(2) MOS.

(a) For purposes of organization, the statistical analysis separates out Infantry, Engineer, Armor and Special Forces Branches for comparison against all other branches (categorized as "other skills"). 18 Series had the highest graduation rate in this breakdown at 57.9%.

Figure 7. Grad Rate By Series

5. Five Year Trends.

(1) Grad Rates and Failures. The below graphs represents failure and graduation trends over the last 5 fiscal years.

Figure 8. 5 Year Trend Grad Rate

Figure 9. 5 Year Trend for Top 5 Failure Reasons

6. Recommendations.

(1) Physical Readiness. Ranger students should arrive at Ranger School prepared for the physical rigors of RAP week. This means being able to conduct the RAP week events in succession, under stress, and possibly in a new climate. All students' physical readiness should be validated by their chain-of-command prior to attending Ranger School. Additionally, if students can only intermittently pass a Ranger Physical Assessment, then they are unlikely to pass the Ranger Physical Assessment at Ranger School.

(2) Pre-Ranger Training. Those students who attend a pre-Ranger course (PRC) tend to perform better in Ranger School than those individuals who do not attend a PRC. PRCs should focus on validating physical readiness and then provide a foundation in the basic skills being taught and evaluated at Ranger School. This includes familiarization with the Ranger Handbook, weapon systems/equipment, basic patrolling fundamentals, and practice in leading small elements. ARTB will hold quarterly VTCs with PRCs and any other units who wish to participate. To join this forum please contact the POCs listed below.

(3) Resiliency. Although the pass rate is relatively high for students who pass RAP week (66%), most of those who fail during the patrolling phases fail for one of these reasons: 1) lack of physical resilience to withstand the rigors of the course while maintaining the ability to lead, 2) lack of mental resilience to lead and follow others while under stress, or 3) lack of tactical/technical knowledge that is so dramatic that it cannot be overcome in only a few weeks. Students with a basic understanding of patrolling tactics and some experience leading a small element (even just in a PRC) will likely pass Ranger School if they can demonstrate the physical and mental resiliency to train for 61 straight days.

7. Methods.

(1) Data for this study was acquired from the Ranger School database to include students who attended Ranger School in a class during FY16.

(2) The Ranger School database assigns each student a new entry line of data associated with a new class each time he begins or recycles the course.

(3) When analyzing the data, students were only considered to be within FY16 when they completed the course between RC 1-16 and RC 11-16. Attendees were calculated by adding the number of graduates and number of failures. Recycles were not included in the number of attendees to prevent redundancies.

(4) Attendees were counted twice if they began Ranger School, were dropped (not recycled) from the course, and returned at a later date within the Fiscal Year. This provides a more accurate graduation rate rather than calculating the graduation rate by individual because some individuals attend the course multiple times before passing. To say that an individual who attended five times and graduated on the fifth try has a 100% graduation rate is inaccurate and does not provide units with appropriate feedback to help Students better prepare for the course.

8. The POCs for this memorandum are MAJ Dan Hurd, Brigade Operations Officer, at (706) 604-8575 or daniel.e.hurd8.mil@mail.mil and CPT Emily McElroy at (706) 545-8515 or Emily.r.mcelroy.mil@mail.mil.

DOUGLAS G. VINCENT
COL, IN
Commanding

FY16
Ranger School Statistics

FY16 Ranger Statistics Methods & Codes

CODES

CWSA	Combat Water Survival Assessment
LN	Land Navigation
LOM	Quit
MED	Medical
P	Patrols
PP	Patrols & Peers
PPS	Patrols, Peers & Spots
PR	Peers
PRS	Peers & Spots
PS	Patrols & Spots
RPA	Ranger Physical Assessment
FM	Foot March
S	Spots
SOR	Serious Observation Report

NOTES

- Data for this study was acquired from the Ranger School database to include students who attended Ranger School in a class during FY16.

- When analyzing the data, students were only considered to be within FY16 when they completed the course between RC 1-16 and RC 11-16.

- Attendees were counted twice if they began Ranger School, were dropped (not recycled) from the course, and returned at a later date within the Fiscal Year.

- Grad Rates in green are greater than the overall FY16 grad rate of 36.8%

- Grad Rates in red are lower than the overall FY16 grad rate of 36.8%

- All percentages are overall percentage of attendees, e.g. if ABC Unit has a 12.3% failure rate for Land Navigation, an individual from ABC Unit had a 12.3 % chance of failing ranger school because of Land Navigation

  - EXCEPTION: Recycle percentages ARE NOT calculated out of overall percentages of attendees. Instead all percentages relating to recycles refer to percentage of recycle, e.g. if AB Unit had an 11.2 % recycle rate for Patrols & Peers then an individual has an 11.2 % chance of recycling for Patrols & Peers IF that individual recycled.

FY16 Ranger Statistics by Source

Unit	Grad Rate	Attendees
1st Armored Division	22.9%	35
1st Cavalry Division	37.5%	16
1st Infantry Division	33.3%	30
10th Mountain Division	34.2%	202
101st Airborne Division	28.5%	172
2nd Infantry Division	26.2%	42
25th Infantry Division	30.7%	244
3rd Infantry Division	21.3%	108
4th Infantry Division	28.2%	39
7 ID/ I Corps	27.3%	22
75th Ranger Regiment	56.7%	554
82nd Airborne Division	37.8%	267
173rd	20.7%	140
ABOLC	21.9%	178
IBOLC	40.6%	936
International Students	32.4%	71
MCCC	16.5%	85
National Guard	43.8%	89
Other BOLC	32.5%	80
Other CCC	11.1%	18
Sister Services	42.9%	28
USASOC	49.8%	203
Other Units*	28.4%	450

FY16 OVERALL STATS

Total Attend	4009	
Total Grad	1476	36.8%
Total Fail	2533	63.2%

Top 5 Graduation Rates

- 75th Ranger Regiment (56.7%)
- USASOC (49.8%)
- National Guard (43.8%)
- IBOLC (40.6%)
- Sister Services (42.9%)

Top Sources (# of Students)

- IBOLC (936)
- 75th Ranger Regiment (554)
- 82nd Airborne (267)
- 25th Infantry Division (244)
- USASOC (203)

Key Takeaways

- National Guard and Sister Services had high grad rates despite small number of attendees. Recommend units adhere to a rigorous process to select Ranger Students as these units have done.

- Those units with mandatory pre-Ranger courses (PRC) tend to have higher graduation rates (75th – SURT, NG – RTAC, 82nd internal PRC, etc.).

*composed of units with fewer than 10 personnel attending in the FY

FY16 Ranger Statistics by MOS

MOS	GRAD	TOTAL	GRAD %
11 Series	1047	2782	37.6%
12 Series	73	153	47.7%
13 Series	57	173	32.9%
15 Series	5	25	20.0%
18 Series	84	145	57.9%
19 Series	63	294	21.4%
25 Series	15	53	28.3%
31 Series	5	15	33.3%
35 Series	24	58	41.4%
42 Series	2	10	20.0%
56 Series	3	14	21.4%
68 Series	26	65	40.0%
74 Series	8	20	40.0%
88 Series	7	27	25.9%
91 Series	9	28	32.1%
92 Series	16	54	29.6%

FY16 OVERALL STATS

Total Attend	4009	
Total Grad	1476	36.8%
Total Fail	2533	63.2%

Key Takeaways

- Only MOS with more than 10 PAX attending included on this slide.

- 18 Series have a notably higher graduation rate compared to other MOS that send a comparable number of Soldiers.

- Several non-combat arms MOS's seem to send only select and vetted individuals to the course resulting in a higher than average graduation rate.

- The below chart displays grad rates for primary target attendees of Ranger School.

Top 5 Graduation Rates*

- 18 Series (57.9%)
- 12 Series (47.7%)
- 35 Series (41.4%)
- 68 Series (40.0%)
- 11 Series (37.6%)

Top Sources

- 11 Series (2782)
- 19 Series (294)
- 18 Series (145)
- 13 Series (173)
- 12 Series (153)

*where more than 50 PAX attended

FY16 Ranger Statistics by Rank

RANK	GRAD	TOTAL	GRAD %	TOP FAILURE
E1	0	6	0.0%	RPA
E2	2	8	25.0%	LN
E3	128	297	43.1%	RPA
E4	294	759	38.7%	RPA
E5	145	425	34.1%	RPA
E6	119	357	33.3%	RPA
E7	22	102	21.6%	RPA
E8	2	7	28.6%	RPA
E9	2	2	100.0%	--
O1	603	1564	38.6%	RPA
O2	101	254	39.8%	RPA
O3	57	222	25.7%	RPA
O4	0	4	0.0%	RPA/MED
O5	1	1	100.0%	--
WO2	0	1	0.0%	RPA

FY16 OVERALL STATS

Total Attend	4009	
Total Grad	1476	36.8%
Total Fail	2533	63.2%

Total Enlisted	1963	36.8%
Total Officer	2046	63.2%

Top Enlisted/Officer Graduation Rates*

- E3 (43.1%)
- O2 (39.8%)

Top Enlisted/Officer Sources

- E4 (759)
- O1 (1564)

Key Takeaway

- The RPA (Pushups, Sit-ups, Chin-ups, Run) was the primary cause of failure for all but one rank (E2) of those ranks that had failures.

*where more than one PAX attended

FY16 Failure Statistics

CAUSE	Total Number	% of All Attendees
RPA	969	24.2%
LN	436	10.9%
FM	327	8.2%
Patrols	239	6.0%
Medical	178	4.4%
LOM	113	2.8%
PP	60	1.5%
PPS	53	1.3%
CWSA	44	1.1%
SOR	32	0.8%
PR	22	0.5%
PS	16	0.4%
Admin	35	0.9%
PRS	6	0.1%
Spots	3	0.1%

Pie chart: RAP Week Failures, 44.3%; Graduate, 36.8%; Academic Failures, 10.0%; Administrative Failures, 8.9%

- Academic reasons for failure includes patrols, spot reports, peer evaluations, or a combination of any of the three.
- Administrative reasons for failure include medical issues, Special Observation Reports (SORs), Lack of Motivation (LOM) statements, or administrative reasons such as missing paperwork, family issues, or other special circumstances.

Top Five Failure Reasons By Division

1ST ARMORED DIVISION		1ST CAVALRY DIVISION		1ST INFANTRY DIVISION		10TH MOUNTAIN		101ST AIRBORNE DIVISION		2ND INFANTRY DIVISION	
GRAD RATE	22.9%	GRAD RATE	37.5%	GRAD RATE	33.3%	GRAD RATE	34.2%	GRAD RATE	28.5%	GRAD RATE	26.2%
Top Five Failures		Top Five Failures		Top Five Failures		Top Five Failures		Top Five Failures		Top Five Failures	
RPA	28.6%	RPA	25.0%	RPA	26.7%	RPA	23.3%	RPA	36.6%	RPA	38.1%
FM	22.9%	FM	18.8%	LN	20.0%	LN	16.8%	LN	12.8%	FM	11.9%
LN	17.1%	LN	18.8%	LOM	10.0%	FM	9.4%	FM	9.3%	LN	7.1%
LOM, P, SOR, MED	2.9% each			P	6.7%	P	5.0%	P	4.1%	LOM, PR	4.8% each
				MED	3.3%	MED	3.0%	PP	2.9%		

25TH INFANTRY DIVISION		3RD INFANTRY DIVISION		4TH INFANTRY DIVISION		7 ID/ I CORPS		75TH RANGER REGIMENT		82ND AIRBORNE DIVISION	
GRAD RATE	30.7%	GRAD RATE	21.3%	GRAD RATE	28.2%	GRAD RATE	27.3%	GRAD RATE	56.7%	GRAD RATE	37.8%
Top Five Failures		Top Five Failures		Top Five Failures		Top Five Failures		Top Five Failures		Top Five Failures	
RPA	24.2%	RPA	36.1%	RPA	25.6%	RPA	45.5%	RPA	13.5%	RPA	25.8%
LN	19.3%	LN	12.0%	FM	12.8%	FM	22.7%	LN	7.6%	LN	12.7%
P	5.7%	FM	9.3%	ADM, CWS, LN, LOM, MED	5.1% each	ADM, CWS, LN, LOM, MED	9.1% each	P	6.9%	FM	5.6%
LOM, FM	4.9% each	LOM, MED	4.6% each					MED	4.9%	P	3.7%
								FM, SOR	2.2%	LOM	3.4%

173RD		ABOLC		IBOLC		MCCC		NATIONAL GUARD		USASOC	
GRAD RATE	20.7%	GRAD RATE	21.9%	GRAD RATE	40.6%	GRAD RATE	16.5%	GRAD RATE	43.8%	GRAD RATE	49.8%
Top Five Failures		Top Five Failures		Top Five Failures		Top Five Failures		Top Five Failures		Top Five Failures	
RPA	30.0%	RPA	29.2%	RPA	22.0%	RPA	49.4%	RPA	18.0%	RPA	21.2%
LN	20.0%	FM	15.2%	LN	8.9%	FM	12.9%	FM	11.2%	FM	9.4%
FM	12.9%	LN	11.8%	P	8.7%	MED	9.4%	LN	7.9%	MED	5.9%
MED	6.4%	P	9.0%	FM	8.1%	LN	5.9%	P	5.6%	LN	5.4%
P	2.9%	MED	5.1%	MED	3.3%	LOM	2.4%	LOM	4.5%	P	3.4%

Key Takeaway

- 18/18 units had RPA (Pushups, Sit-ups, Chin-ups, Run) as the primary cause of failure. All commanders have signed off that Students are prepared to pass an RPA before attending Ranger School.

FY16 Recycle Statistics

Unit	TOP Recycle Cause	% of Recycles
1st Armored Division	P	42.9%
1st Cavalry Division	P	50.0%
1st Infantry Division	P	71.4%
10th Mountain Division	P	50.0%
101st Airborne Division	P	60.0%
2nd Infantry Division	P	50.0%
25th Infantry Division	P	56.8%
3rd Infantry Division	P	48.1%
4th Infantry Division	P	53.3%
7 ID/ I Corps	PP	42.9%
75th Ranger Regiment	P	66.4%
82nd Airborne Division	P	58.4%
173rd	P	45.7%
ABOLC	P	58.9%
IBOLC	P	59.3%
International Students	P	68.4%
MCCC	P	68.8%
National Guard	P	59.5%
Other BOLC	P	53.1%
Other CCC	P	66.7%
Sister Services	P	75.0%
USASOC	P	64.6%
Other Units	P	59.3%

FY16 RECYCLE STATS

Total Recycles	1718

Top 5 Reasons for Recycle

CAUSE	Total RECYCLES	% RECYCLES
P	1033	60.1%
PP	192	11.2%
PR	120	7.0%
PS	109	6.3%
SOR	98	5.7%

Key Takeaways

- All but one unit had Patrols as their number 1 reason for recycle.

- 856/1476 Ranger Graduates recycled at least one phase of Ranger School. In other words, 58.0% of those that eventually graduate Ranger School do so only after recycling at least 1 phase of Ranger School.

- 620 Graduates (62-day Rangers) did NOT recycle the course (15.5% of overall attendees).

- Units should prepare their Soldiers to be at Ranger School for longer than 2 months.

Ranger School Trends FY12-16

2012		
# Attended		4033
1859 Enlisted		
2174 Officers		
# Grad	1816	45.0%
# Fail	2217	55.0%
Top Sources		
1. IBOLC		588/1068
2. 75th RR		376/606
3. USASOC		125/244
4. 101st		68/188
5. 10th Mtn		54/159
Top Failure Reasons		
1. LN	530	13.1%
2. FM	428	10.6%
3. RPA	400	9.9%
4. MED	216	5.4%
5. P	121	3.0%
Reasons For Recycle		
1. P		68.0%
2. SOR		8.6%
3. PR		8.5%
4. PPR		8.4%
5. MED		2.6%

2013		
# Attended		3855
1895 Enlisted		
1960 Officers		
# Grad	1506	39.1%
# Fail	2349	60.9%
Top Sources		
1. IBOLC		490/1020
2. 75th RR		336/701
3. 82nd		131/306
4. USASOC		54/160
5. ABOLC		54/158
Top Failure Reasons		
1. LN	611	15.8%
2. RPA	381	9.9%
3. FM	334	8.7%
4. MED	282	7.3%
5. P	177	4.6%
Reasons For Recycle		
1. P		48.4%
2. SOR		12.9%
2. PPR		12.9%
4. MED		9.7%
5. PS, PR		6.5% Each

2014		
# Attended		4057
1925 Enlisted		
2132 Officers		
# Grad	1609	39.7%
# Fail	2448	60.3%
Top Sources		
1. IBOLC		484/1079
2. 75th RR		318/589
3. 82nd		117/231
4. USASOC		67/186
5. 25TH ID		54/180
Top Failure Reasons		
1. RPA	643	15.8%
2. LN	382	9.4%
3. FM	379	9.3%
4. MED	238	5.9%
5. P	225	5.5%
Reasons For Recycle		
1. P		60.9%
2. SOR		8.7%
2. PPR		6.5%
4. S, PS, PPS, PR, MED		4.3% Each

2015		
# Attended		3870
1814 Enlisted		
2056 Officers		
# Grad	1405	36.3%
# Fail	2465	63.7%
Top Sources		
1. IBOLC		383/925
2. 75th RR		340/591
3. 10th Mtn		74/361
4. 82nd		84/181
5. 101st		41/169
Top Failure Reasons		
1. RPA	862	22.3%
2. FM	415	10.7%
3. LN	382	9.9%
4. P	198	5.1%
5. MED	185	4.8%
Reasons For Recycle		
1. P		56.5%
2. PPR		10.6%
3. PS		9.6%
4. SOR		7.9%
5. PR		5.2%

2016		
# Attended		4009
1963 Enlisted		
2046 Officers		
# Grad	1476	36.8%
# Fail	2533	63.2%
Top Sources		
1. IBOLC		380/936
2. 75th RR		314/554
3. 82nd		101/267
4. 25th ID		75/244
5. USASOC		101/203
Top Failure Reasons		
1. RPA	969	24.2%
2. LN	436	10.9%
3. FM	327	8.2%
4. P	239	6.0%
5. MED	178	4.4%
Reasons For Recycle		
1. P		60.1%
2. PP		11.2%
3. PR		6.9%
4. PS		6.3%
5. SOR		5.7%

Ranger School Trends FY12-16

5 Year Trend Grad Rate

45.0%
39.1%
39.7%
36.3%
36.8%

5 Year Trend Top 5 Failure Reasons

Legend: LN, FM, RPA, MED, P

Key Takeaways

- Inability of students to meet physical prerequisites (RAP week events) is the reason for grad rate decrease over the last five years.

1st Armored Division Ranger Graduation Rates

1st Armored Division	GRAD	TOTAL	GRAD %
Overall	70	202	22.9%
Enlisted	6	18	33.3%
Officer	48	121	11.8%

RANK	GRAD	TOTAL	GRAD %
E3	0	2	0.0%
E4	2	5	40.0%
E5	2	7	28.6%
E6	2	4	50.0%
O1	1	7	14.3%
O2	1	8	12.5%
O3	0	2	0.0%

# Attended		35	
18	Enlisted	17	Officers

GRAD RATE	8	22.9%
FAIL RATE	27	77.1%

Top Five Failures*		
1. RPA	10	28.6%
2. FM	8	22.9%
3. LN	6	17.1%
4. P, LOM, SOR	1	2.9% each

Reasons For Recycle**	
7	
1. P	42.9%
2. PPR	28.6%
3. PS	14.3%
3. PR	14.3%

*Percentage of overall # attend
**Percentages of overall # of recycles

Those percentages highlighted in
RED are below the Ranger School
FY16 Average of 36.8%.

1st Armored Division Trends Ranger School Statistics

2012

# Attended		56
38 Enlisted		
18 Officers		
# Grad	12	21.4%
# Fail	44	78.6%

Top 5 Failure

1.	RPA	10	17.9%
2.	LN	8	14.3%
3.	CWS	5	8.9%
4.	FM	5	8.9%
5.	ADMIN	4	7.1%

Reasons For Recycle

1.	P	42.9%
2.	PPR	28.6%
3.	PR	21.4%
4.	MED	7.1%

2013

# Attended		26
16 Enlisted		
10 Officers		
# Grad	6	23.1%
# Fail	20	76.9%

Top 5 Failure

1.	LN	7	26.9%
2.	RPA	4	15.4%
3.	LOM	3	11.5%
4.	FM	2	7.7%
4.	MED	2	7.7%

Reasons For Recycle

1.	P	63.6%
2.	PPR	9.1%
2.	MED	9.1%
2.	PRS	9.1%
2.	PR	9.1%

2014

# Attended		37
20 Enlisted		
17 Officers		
# Grad	8	21.6%
# Fail	29	78.4%

Top 5 Failure

1.	LN	10	27.0%
2.	RPA	7	18.9%
3.	LOM	3	8.1%
4.	FM	2	5.4%
5.	P, ADMIN	2	5.4%

Reasons For Recycle

1.	P	42.9%
2.	PPR	28.6%
3.	PR	14.3%
4.	PS	7.1%
4.	LOM	7.1%

2015

# Attended		22
16 Enlisted		
6 Officers		
# Grad	4	18.2%
# Fail	18	81.8%

Top 5 Failure

1.	LN	6	27.3%
2.	RPA	2	9.1%
2.	FM	2	9.1%
2.	CWS	2	9.1%
2.	MED	2	9.1%

Reasons For Recycle

1.	P	40.0%
1.	PS	20.0%
3.	PR	20.0%

2016

# Attended		35
18 Enlisted		
17 Officers		
# Grad	8	22.9%
# Fail	27	77.1%

Top 5 Failure

1.	RPA	10	28.6%
2.	FM	8	22.9%
3.	LN	6	17.1%
4.	P, LOM, SOR, MED	1	2.9%

Reasons For Recycle

1.	P	42.9%
2.	PPR	28.6%
3.	PS	14.3%
3.	PR	14.3%

1st Cavalry Division Ranger Graduation Rates

1st Cavalry Division	GRAD	TOTAL	GRAD %
Overall	6	10	37.5%
Enlisted	1	10	10.0%
Officer	5	6	83.3%

RANK	GRAD	TOTAL	GRAD %
E4	0	2	0.0%
E5	1	7	14.3%
E7	0	1	0.0%
O1	3	4	75.0%
O2	1	1	100.0%
O3	1	1	100.0%

# Attended		16
10 Enlisted	6	Officers

GRAD RATE	6	37.5%
FAIL RATE	10	62.5%

Top Five Failures*		
1. RPA	4	25.0%
2. FM	3	18.8%
2. LN	3	18.8%

Reasons For Recycle**	
7	
1. P	42.9%
2. PP	28.6%
3. PR	14.3%
3. PS	14.3%

*Percentage of overall # attend
**Percentages of overall # of recycles

Those percentages highlighted in RED are below the Ranger School FY16 Average of 36.8%.

1st Cavalry Division Trends Ranger School Statistics

2012		
# Attended		43
25 Enlisted		
18 Officers		
# Grad	7	16.3%
# Fail	36	83.7%
Top 5 Failure		
1. LN	7	16.3%
2. P	5	11.6%
3. RPA	4	9.3%
3. ADMIN	4	9.3%
3. FM	4	9.3%
Reasons For Recycle		
1. P		64.7%
2. PPR		17.6%
3. PR		11.8%
4. MED		5.9%

2013		
# Attended		24
12 Enlisted		
12 Officers		
# Grad	7	29.2%
# Fail	17	70.8%
Top 5 Failure		
1. LN	7	29.2%
2. RPA	4	16.7%
3. ADMIN	3	12.5%
4. MED	2	8.3%
4. P	2	8.3%
Reasons For Recycle		
1. PPR		62.5%
2. P		37.5%

2014		
# Attended		13
9 Enlisted		
4 Officers		
# Grad	1	7.7%
# Fail	12	92.3%
Top 5 Failure		
1. LN	5	38.5%
2. RPA	3	23.1%
3. FM	2	15.4%
4. MED	1	7.7%
4. SOR	1	7.7%
Reasons For Recycle		
1. P		66.7%
2. S		33.3%

2015		
# Attended		14
7 Enlisted		
7 Officers		
# Grad	2	14.3%
# Fail	12	85.7%
Top 5 Failure		
1. RPA	5	35.7%
2. FM	2	14.3%
2. LOM	2	14.3%
4. CWS, LN, P	1	7.1%
Reasons For Recycle		
1. P		40.0%
2. PP		20.0%
3. SOR		20.0%

2016		
# Attended		16
10 Enlisted		
6 Officers		
# Grad	6	37.5%
# Fail	10	62.5%
Top 5 Failure		
1. RPA	4	25.0%
2. FM	3	18.8%
2. LN	3	18.8%
Reasons For Recycle		
1. P		42.9%
2. PP		28.6%
3. PR		14.3%
3. PS		14.3%

14

1st Infantry Division Ranger Graduation Rates

1st Infantry Division	GRAD	TOTAL	GRAD %
Overall	10	30	**33.3%**
Enlisted	7	22	31.8%
Officer	3	8	37.5%

RANK	GRAD	TOTAL	GRAD %
E4	2	5	40.0%
E5	3	10	30.0%
E6	1	6	16.7%
E7	1	1	100.0%
O1	0	3	100.0%
O2	0	1	0.0%
O3	3	4	0.0%

# Attended		30	
22	Enlisted	8	Officers

GRAD RATE	10	**33.3%**
FAIL RATE	20	66.7%

Top Five Failures*		
1. RPA	8	26.7%
2. LN	6	20.0%
3. LOM	3	10.0%
4. P	2	6.7%
5. MED	1	3.3%

Reasons For Recycle**	
7	
1. P	71.4%
2. PS	28.6%

*Percentage of overall # attend
**Percentages of overall # of recycles

Those percentages highlighted in RED are below the Ranger School FY16 Average of 36.8%.

1st Infantry Division Trends Ranger School Statistics

2012			2013			2014			2015			2016		
# Attended		81	# Attended		71	# Attended		51	# Attended		24	# Attended		30
49 Enlisted			40 Enlisted			43 Enlisted			23 Enlisted			22 Enlisted		
32 Officers			31 Officers			8 Officers			1 Officers			8 Officers		
# Grad	26	32.1%	# Grad	23	32.4%	# Grad	12	23.5%	# Grad	6	25.0%	# Grad	10	33.3%
# Fail	55	67.9%	# Fail	48	67.6%	# Fail	39	76.5%	# Fail	18	75.0%	# Fail	20	66.7%
Top 5 Failure			**Top 5 Failure**			**Top 5 Failure**			**Top 5 Failure**			**Top 5 Failure**		
1.	LN	14	17.3%	1.	LN	13	18.3%	1.	LN	10	19.6%	1.	RPA	6	25.0%	1.	RPA	8	26.7%
2.	FM	12	14.8%	2.	RPA	8	11.3%	2.	RPA	8	15.7%	2.	LN	6	25.0%	2.	LN	6	20.0%
3.	RPA	10	12.3%	3.	FM	7	9.9%	3.	FM	7	13.7%	3.	MED	4	16.7%	3.	LOM	3	10.0%
4.	MED	6	7.4%	4.	MED	6	8.5%	4.	MED	6	11.8%	4.	P	1	4.2%	4.	P	2	6.7%
5.	PPR	5	6.2%	5.	LOM	3	4.2%	5.	SOR	3	5.9%	4.	FM	1	4.2%	5.	MED	1	3.3%
Reasons For Recycle			**Reasons For Recycle**			**Reasons For Recycle**			**Reasons For Recycle**			**Reasons For Recycle**		
1.	P	64.7%	1.	P	63.6%	1.	P	50.0%	1.	P	100.0%	1.	P	71.4%
2.	PR	17.6%	2.	SOR	9.1%	2.	S	25.0%				2.	PS	28.6%
3.	PPR	11.8%	2.	PS	9.1%	3.	KB	12.5%						
4.	SOR	5.9%	2.	PR	9.1%	3.	PPS	12.5%						
			2.	S	9.1%									

16

10th Mountain Division Ranger Graduation Rates

10th Mountain Division	GRAD	TOTAL	GRAD %
Overall	**69**	**202**	**34.2%**
Enlisted	22	98	22.4%
Officer	47	104	45.2%

RANK	GRAD	TOTAL	GRAD %
E1	0	1	0.0%
E2	0	3	0.0%
E3	1	18	5.6%
E4	6	33	18.2%
E5	5	17	29.4%
E6	9	17	52.9%
E7	0	8	0.0%
E9	1	1	100.0%
O1	26	53	49.1%
O2	18	37	48.6%
O3	3	13	23.1%
WO2	0	1	0.0%

# Attended		202	
98	Enlisted	121	Officers

GRAD RATE	69	34.2%
FAIL RATE	133	65.8%

Top Five Failures*		
1. RPA	47	23.3%
2. LN	34	16.8%
3. FM	19	9.4%
4. P	10	5.0%
5. MED	6	3.0%

Reasons For Recycle**	
71	
1. P	56.3%
2. PPR	19.7%
3. PS	9.9%
4. PR	4.2%
4. SOR	4.2%

*Percentage of overall # attend
**Percentages of overall # of recycles

Those percentages highlighted in RED are below the Ranger School FY16 Average of 36.8%.

10th Mountain Division Trends Ranger School Statistics

2012		
# Attended		159
111 Enlisted		
48 Officers		
# Grad	54	34.0%
# Fail	105	66.0%
Top 5 Failure		
1. LN	29	18.2%
2. FM	25	15.7%
3. RPA	20	12.6%
4. MED	7	4.4%
5. LOM, PP	5	3.1%
Reasons For Recycle		
1. P		64.0%
2. PP		14.0%
3. PR		8.0%
4. SOR		6.0%
5. MED, PRS, PS, S		2.0% each

2013		
# Attended		120
80 Enlisted		
40 Officers		
# Grad	32	26.7%
# Fail	88	73.3%
Top 5 Failure		
1. LN	24	20.0%
2. MED	17	14.2%
3. FM	12	10.0%
4. RPA	10	8.3%
5. LOM	6	5.0%
Reasons For Recycle		
1. P		48.4%
2. SOR		12.9%
2. PP		12.9%
4. MED		9.7%
5. PS		6.5%
5. PR		6.5%

2014		
# Attended		134
90 Enlisted		
44 Officers		
# Grad	42	31.3%
# Fail	92	68.7%
Top 5 Failure		
1. LN	21	15.7%
2. FM	18	13.4%
3. RPA	17	12.7%
4. ADMIN	8	6.0%
5. MED	7	5.2%
Reasons For Recycle		
1. P		60.9%
2. SOR		8.7%
3. PP		6.5%
4. S, PS, PPS, PR, MED		4.3% each

2015		
# Attended		361
219 Enlisted		
142 Officers		
# Grad	74	20.5%
# Fail	287	79.5%
Top 5 Failure		
1. RPA	105	29.1%
2. LN	59	16.3%
3. FM	48	13.3%
4. P	14	3.9%
5. LOM, MED	13	3.6%
Reasons For Recycle		
1. P		47.9%
2. PP		14.5%
3. PS		11.1%
4. SOR		7.7%
5. PR		4.3%

2016		
# Attended		202
98 Enlisted		
121 Officers		
# Grad	69	34.2%
# Fail	133	65.8%
Top 5 Failure		
1. RPA	47	23.3%
2. LN	34	16.8%
3. FM	19	9.4%
4. P	10	5.0%
5. MED	6	3.0%
Reasons For Recycle		
1. P		60.9%
2. PPR		19.7%
3. PS		9.9%
4. PR		4.2%
5. SOR		4.2%

18

101ˢᵗ Airborne Division Ranger Graduation Rates

101ˢᵗ Airborne Division	GRAD	TOTAL	GRAD %
Overall	49	246	19.92%
Enlisted	29	125	23.20%
Officer	20	121	16.53%

RANK	GRAD	TOTAL	GRAD %
E3	5	21	23.8%
E4	7	30	23.3%
E5	10	47	21.3%
E6	7	25	28.0%
E7	0	2	0.0%
O1	11	24	45.8%
O2	7	16	43.8%
O3	2	7	28.6%

# Attended		172	
125	Enlisted	47	Officers

GRAD RATE	49	28.5%
FAIL RATE	123	71.5%

Top Five Failures*		
1. RPA	63	36.6%
2. LN	22	12.8%
3. FM	16	9.3%
4. P	7	4.1%
5. PP	5	2.9%
Reasons For Recycle**		
55		
1. P		60.0%
2. PPR		14.5%
3. SOR		7.3%
4. PRS		5.5%
5. MED/PRS/PS		3.6% each

*Percentage of overall # attend
**Percentages of overall # of recycles

Those percentages highlighted in RED are below the Ranger School FY16 Average of 36.8%.

101st Airborne Division Trends Ranger School Statistics

2012		
# Attended		188
98 Enlisted		
90 Officers		
# Grad	66	35.1%
# Fail	122	64.9%
Top 5 Failure		
1. RPA	32	17.0%
2. LN	30	16.0%
3. FM	19	10.1%
4. MED	10	5.3%
5. PPR	7	3.7%
Reasons For Recycle		
1. P		76.5%
2. PPR		7.7%
3. PR		5.9%
3. MED		5.9%
5. PS		2.0%
5. SOR		2.0%

2013		
# Attended		115
77 Enlisted		
38 Officers		
# Grad	30	26.1%
# Fail	85	73.9%
Top 5 Failure		
1. LN	22	19.1%
2. RPA	19	16.5%
3. FM	14	12.2%
4. P	6	5.2%
Reasons For Recycle		
1. P		50.0%
2. PR		14.7%
3. PPR		8.8%
3. MED		8.8%
3. SOR		8.8%

2014		
# Attended		154
101 Enlisted		
53 Officers		
# Grad	49	31.8%
# Fail	105	68.2%
Top 5 Failure		
1. RPA	35	22.7%
2. LN	18	11.7%
2. FM	18	11.7%
4. MED	8	5.2%
Reasons For Recycle		
1. P		70.2%
2. PPR		8.8%
2. PR		8.8%
4. PS		5.3%
5. MED, PS,S, SOR		1.8%

2015		
# Attended		169
90 Enlisted		
79 Officers		
# Grad	41	24.3%
# Fail	128	75.7%
Top 5 Failure		
1. RPA	58	34.3%
2. FM	24	14.2%
3. LN	11	6.5%
4. MED	8	4.7%
5. ADMIN, LOM	6	3.6%
Reasons For Recycle		
1. P		49.2%
2. PP		16.9%
3. SOR		10.2%
3. PS		8.5%
3. PR		6.8%

2016		
# Attended		172
125 Enlisted		
47 Officers		
# Grad	49	28.5%
# Fail	123	71.5%
Top 5 Failure		
1. RPA	63	36.6%
2. LN	22	12.8%
3. FM	16	9.3
4. p	7	4.1%
5. PP	5	2.9%
Reasons For Recycle		
1. P		60.0%
2. PPR		14.5%
3. SOR		7.3%
4. PRS		5.5%
5. MED, PRS, PS		3.6%

2ND Infantry Division Ranger Graduation Rates

2nd Infantry Division	GRAD	TOTAL	GRAD %
Overall	11	42	26.2%
Enlisted	7	27	25.9%
Officer	4	15	26.7%

RANK	GRAD	TOTAL	GRAD %
E3	1	4	25.0%
E4	1	6	16.7%
E5	4	12	33.3%
E6	1	5	20.0%
O1	1	2	50.0%
O2	3	12	25.0%
O3	0	1	0.0%

# Attended		42	
27	Enlisted	15	Officers

GRAD RATE	11	26.2%
FAIL RATE	31	73.8%

Top Five Failures*		
1. RPA	16	38.1%
2. FM	5	11.9%
3. LN	3	7.1%
4. LOM	2	4.8%
4. PR	2	4.8%
Reasons For Recycle**		
16		
1. P		50.0%
2. PP		18.8%
3. PR		12.5%
4. MED/PRS/S		6.3% each

*Percentage of overall # attend
**Percentages of overall # of recycles

Those percentages highlighted in
RED are below the Ranger School
FY16 Average of 36.8%.

2ND Infantry Division Trends Ranger School Statistics

2012

# Attended		72
35 Enlisted		
37 Officers		
# Grad	26	15.3%
# Fail	55	84.7%

Top 5 Failure

1.	RPA	19	26.4%
2.	LN	13	18.1%
3.	FM	8	11.1%
4.	MED	4	5.6%
5.	ADMIN, LOM, P, PPR	3	4.2% each

Reasons For Recycle

1.	P	55.6%
2.	PPR	22.2%
2.	PRS	22.2%

2013

# Attended		44
33 Enlisted		
11 Officers		
# Grad	10	22.7%
# Fail	34	77.3%

Top 5 Failure

1.	LN	19	43.2%
2.	MED	7	15.9%
3.	CWSA	4	9.1%
4.	RPA	3	6.8%
4.	FM	3	6.8%

Reasons For Recycle

1.	P	75.0%
2.	ADMIN	8.3%
2.	PPR	8.3%
2.	PR	8.3%

2014

# Attended		68
43 Enlisted		
25 Officers		
# Grad	28	58.8%
# Fail	40	41.2%

Top 5 Failure

1.	RPA	9	13.2%
2.	LN	8	11.8%
3.	FM	7	10.3%
4.	LOM	5	7.4%
4.	P	4	5.9%

Reasons For Recycle

1.	P	58.3%
2.	PPR	16.7%
3.	SOR	12.5%
4.	KB	4.2%
4.	PS	4.2%
4.	PR	4.2%

2015

# Attended		52
28 Enlisted		
24 Officers		
# Grad	15	28.8%
# Fail	37	71.2%

Top 5 Failure

1.	RPA	22	42.3%
2.	FM	3	5.8%
2.	LN	3	5.8%
2.	MED	3	5.8%
5.	ADM, PPS	2	3.8%

Reasons For Recycle

1.	P	50.0%
2.	PS	16.7%
2.	SOR	16.7%
4.	PP	8.3%
4.	PPS	8.3%

2016

# Attended		42
27 Enlisted		
15 Officers		
# Grad	11	26.2%
# Fail	31	73.8%

Top 5 Failure

1.	RPA	16	38.1%
2.	FM	5	11.9%
3.	LN	3	7.1%
4.	LOM	2	4.8%
4.	PR	2	4.8%

Reasons For Recycle

1.	P	50.0%
2.	PP	18.8%
3.	PR	12.5%
4.	MED, PRS, S	6.3% each

25th Infantry Division Ranger Graduation Rates

3rd Infantry Division	GRAD	TOTAL	GRAD %
Overall	**75**	**244**	**30.7%**
Enlisted	45	172	26.2%
Officer	30	72	41.7%

RANK	GRAD	TOTAL	GRAD %
E3	6	18	33.3%
E4	13	67	19.4%
E5	16	44	36.4%
E6	10	37	27.0%
E7	0	4	0.0%
E8	0	2	0.0%
O1	12	24	50.0%
O2	16	36	44.4%
O3	2	12	16.7%

# Attended		244
172 Enlisted	72	Officers

GRAD RATE	75	30.7%
FAIL RATE	169	69.3%

Top Five Failures*		
1. RPA	59	24.2%
2. LN	47	19.3%
3. P	14	5.7%
4. FM	12	4.9%
4. LOM	12	4.9%

Reasons For Recycle**	
111	
1. P	56.8%
2. PP	16.2%
3. PS	7.2%
4. SOR	6.3%
5. PR	5.4%

*Percentage of overall # attend
**Percentages of overall # of recycles

Those percentages highlighted in
RED are below the Ranger School
FY16 Average of 36.8%.

25th Infantry Division Ranger School Statistics

2012		
# Attended		152
111 Enlisted		
41 Officers		
# Grad	45	29.6%
# Fail	107	70.4%
Top 5 Failure		
1. LN	41	27.0%
2. FM	18	11.8%
2. RPA	18	11.8%
4. MED	5	3.3%
4. PP	5	3.3%
Reasons For Recycle		
1. P		65.2%
2. PR		13.0%
3. MED		8.7%
3. PPR		8.7%
5. ADMIN, SOR		2.2%

2013		
# Attended		144
102 Enlisted		
42 Officers		
# Grad	45	31.3%
# Fail	99	68.8%
Top 5 Failure		
1. LN	27	18.8%
2. RPA	17	11.8%
3. FM	15	10.4%
4. MED	11	7.6%
5. SOR	8	5.6%
Reasons For Recycle		
1. P		50.0%
2. PR		16.7%
3. PS		11.9%
4. PPR		9.5%
5. MED		7.1%

2014		
# Attended		180
140 Enlisted		
40 Officers		
# Grad	54	30.0%
# Fail	126	70.0%
Top 5 Failure		
1. RPA	29	16.1%
2. LN	26	14.4%
3. MED	20	11.1%
4. FM	15	8.3%
5. LOM	11	6.1%
Reasons For Recycle		
1. P		53.6%
2. PPR		12.5%
2. SOR		12.5%
4. PR		7.1%
4. PS		7.1%

2015		
# Attended		163
117 Enlisted		
46 Officers		
# Grad	43	26.4%
# Fail	120	73.6%
Top 5 Failure		
1. RPA	31	19.0%
2. FM	27	16.6%
3. LN	23	14.1%
4. P	11	6.7%
5. MED	9	5.5%
Reasons For Recycle		
1. P		49.2%
2. PP		18.5%
3. SOR		9.2%
3. PS		9.2%
5. PRS		4.6%

2016		
# Attended		244
172 Enlisted		
72 Officers		
# Grad	75	30.7%
# Fail	169	69.3%
Top 5 Failure		
1. RPA	59	24.2%
2. LN	47	19.3%
3. P	14	5.7%
4. FM	12	4.9%
4. LOM	12	4.9%
Reasons For Recycle		
1. P		56.8%
2. PP		16.2%
3. PS		7.2%
4. SOR		6.3%
5. PR		5.4%

24

3rd Infantry Division Ranger Graduation Rates

3rd Infantry Division	GRAD	TOTAL	GRAD %
Overall	23	108	**21.30%**
Enlisted	12	73	16.44%
Officer	11	35	31.43%

RANK	GRAD	TOTAL	GRAD %
E3	1	9	11.1%
E4	1	18	5.6%
E5	6	27	22.2%
E6	4	15	26.7%
E7	0	3	0.0%
E8	0	1	0.0%
O1	4	14	0.0%
O2	7	19	0.0%
O3	0	2	0.0%

# Attended		108	
73	Enlisted	35	Officers

GRAD RATE	23	**21.3%**
FAIL RATE	85	78.7%

Top Five Failures*		
1. RPA	39	36.1%
2. LN	13	12.0%
3. FM	10	9.3%
4. LOM	5	4.6%
4. MED	5	4.6%

Reasons For Recycle**	
27	
1. P	48.1%
2. Peers	14.8%
3. PP/PS	11.1% each
4. MED/SOR	3.7% each

*Percentage of overall # attend
**Percentages of overall # of recycles

Those percentages highlighted in RED are below the Ranger School FY16 Average of 36.8%.

3rd Infantry Division Trends Ranger School Statistics

2012

# Attended		93
53 Enlisted		
40 Officers		
# Grad	33	35.5%
# Fail	60	64.5%

Top 5 Failure

1.	FM	12	12.9%
2.	RPA	11	11.8%
3.	LN	9	9.7%
4.	CWSA, LOM, MED	5	5.4%

Reasons For Recycle

1.	P	85.7%
2.	PR	7.1%
3.	PS	3.6%
3.	SOR	3.6%
3.	LOM	3.6%

2013

# Attended		58
40 Enlisted		
18 Officers		
# Grad	12	20.7%
# Fail	46	79.3%

Top 5 Failure

1.	LN	9	15.5%
2.	FM	8	13.8%
3.	MED	6	10.3%
4.	ADMIN	4	6.9%
4.	SOR	4	6.9%

Reasons For Recycle

1.	P	55.0%
2.	PPR	20.0%
3.	PR	10.0%
3.	SOR	10.0%
5.	MED	5.0%

2014

# Attended		89
55 Enlisted		
34 Officers		
# Grad	15	16.9%
# Fail	74	83.1%

Top 5 Failure

1.	LN	22	24.7%
2.	RPA	18	20.2%
3.	FM	12	13.5%
4.	LOM	5	5.6%
5.	ADMIN, MED	3	3.4%

Reasons For Recycle

1.	P	50.0%
2.	PPR	33.3%
3.	SOR	11.1%
4.	PR	5.6%
4.	PPS	5.6%

2015

# Attended		86
47 Enlisted		
39 Officers		
# Grad	17	19.8%
# Fail	69	80.2%

Top 5 Failure

1.	RPA	26	30.2%
2.	FM	13	15.1%
3.	LN	10	11.6%
4.	CWS	5	5.8%
5.	ADMIN, MED	4	4.7%

Reasons For Recycle

1.	P	53.8%
2.	PP	19.2%
3.	MED	7.7%
3.	PS	7.7%
3.	S	7.7%

2016

# Attended		108
73 Enlisted		
35 Officers		
# Grad	23	21.3%
# Fail	85	78.7%

Top 5 Failure

1.	RPA	39	36.1%
2.	LN	13	12.0%
3.	FM	10	9.3%
4.	LOM	5	4.6%
4.	MED	5	4.6%

Reasons For Recycle

1.	P	48.1%
2.	PR	14.8%
3.	PP	11.1%
3.	PS	11.1%
4.	MED	3.7%
4.	SOR	3.7%

4th Infantry Division Ranger Graduation Rates

4th Infantry Division	GRAD	TOTAL	GRAD %
Overall	11	39	28.2%
Enlisted	6	27	22.2%
Officer	5	12	41.7%

# Attended		39	
27	Enlisted	12	Officers

GRAD RATE	11	28.2%
FAIL RATE	28	71.8%

RANK	GRAD	TOTAL	GRAD %
E3	0	1	0.0%
E4	1	5	20.0%
E5	3	14	21.4%
E6	2	5	40.0%
E7	0	2	0.0%
O1	2	4	50.0%
O2	2	5	40.0%
O3	1	2	50.0%
O4	0	1	0.0%

Top Five Failures*		
1. RPA	10	25.6%
2. FM	5	12.8%
3. ADM, CWSA	2	5.1%
3. LN, LOM	2	5.1%
3. MED	2	5.1%

Reasons For Recycle**	
15	
1. P	53.3%
2. PP	13.3%
2. PS	13.3%
2. SOR	13.3%
3. PR	6.7%

*Percentage of overall # attend
**Percentages of overall # of recycles

Those percentages highlighted in RED are below the Ranger School FY16 Average of 36.8%.

4th Infantry Division Trends Ranger School Statistics

2012

# Attended		69
43 Enlisted		
26 Officers		
# Grad	20	29.0%
# Fail	49	71.0%

Top 5 Failure

1.	LN	17	24.6%
2.	FM	10	14.5%
3.	RPA	9	13.0%
4.	MED	8	11.6%
5.	P	6	8.7%

Reasons For Recycle

1.	P	85.7%
2.	MED	10.0%
2.	PPR	10.0%
2.	PPS	10.0%
2.	S	10.0%
2.	SOR	10.0%

2013

# Attended		77
51 Enlisted		
26 Officers		
# Grad	18	23.4%
# Fail	59	76.6%

Top 5 Failure

1.	RPA	19	24.7%
2.	LN	15	19.5%
3.	FM	6	7.8%
4.	MED	5	6.5%
5.	P	3	3.9%

Reasons For Recycle

1.	P	57.6%
2.	PPR	12.1%
3.	SOR	6.1%
3.	PRS	6.1%
3.	PR	6.1%
3.	S	6.1%

2014

# Attended		80
58 Enlisted		
22 Officers		
# Grad	28	35.0%
# Fail	52	65.0%

Top 5 Failure

1.	LN	22	27.5%
2.	RPA	21	26.3%
3.	FM	12	15.0%
4.	LOM	5	6.3%
5.	MED, ADMIN	3	3.8%

Reasons For Recycle

1.	P	72.4%
2.	PPR	6.9%
2.	S	6.9%
3.	PR	5.3%
3.	PRS	5.3%
3.	PPS	5.3%
3.	S	5.3%

2015

# Attended		59
49 Enlisted		
26 Officers		
# Grad	22	37.3%
# Fail	37	62.7%

Top 5 Failure

1.	RPA	12	20.3%
2.	FM	6	10.2%
2.	MED	6	10.2%
4.	LN	5	8.5%
5.	ADM	2	3.4%

Reasons For Recycle

1.	P	58.8%
2.	SOR	17.6%
3.	PP, PR, PS, S	5.9% each

2016

# Attended		39
27 Enlisted		
12 Officers		
# Grad	11	28.2%
# Fail	28	71.8%

Top 5 Failure

1.	RPA	10	25.6%
2.	FM	5	12.8%
3.	ADM, CWSA	2	5.1%
3.	LN, LOM	2	5.1%
3.	MED	2	5.1%

Reasons For Recycle

1.	P	53.3%
2.	PP	13.3%
2.	PS	13.3%
2.	SOR	13.3%
5.	PR	6.7%

7th Infantry Division
Ranger Graduation Rates

7th Infantry Division	GRAD	TOTAL	GRAD %
Overall	6	22	27.3%
Enlisted	3	16	18.8%
Officer	3	6	50.0%

# Attended		22	
16	Enlisted	6	Officers

GRAD RATE	6	27.3%
FAIL RATE	16	72.7%

RANK	GRAD	TOTAL	GRAD %
E3	0	1	0.0%
E4	1	7	14.3%
E5	0	5	0.0%
E6	2	3	66.7%
O1	1	2	50.0%
O2	2	4	50.0%

Top Five Failures*		
1. RPA	10	45.5%
2. FM	5	22.7%
3. ADM, CWSA	2	9.1%
3. LN, LOM	2	9.1%
3. MED	2	9.1%
Reasons For Recycle**		
7		
1. PP		42.9%
2. P		28.6%
3. PRS		14.3%
3. PS		14.3%

*Percentage of overall # attend
**Percentages of overall # of recycles

Those percentages highlighted in
RED are below the Ranger School
FY16 Average of 36.8%.

7th Infantry Division Trends Ranger School Statistics

2012

# Attended		29	
16 Enlisted			
13 Officers			
# Grad	8		27.6%
# Fail	21		72.4%

Top 5 Failure

1.	LN	7	24.1%
2.	RPA	6	20.7%
3.	MED	2	6.9%
3.	CWSA	2	6.9%
3.	FM	2	6.9%
3.	P	2	6.9%

Reasons For Recycle

1.	P	66.7%
2.	PR	22.2%
3.	SOR	11.1%

2013

# Attended		17	
11 Enlisted			
6 Officers			
# Grad	7	41.2%	
# Fail	10	58.8%	

Top 5 Failure

1.	LN	3	17.6%
1.	SOR	3	17.6%
2.	ADMIN	1	5.9%
2.	MED	1	5.9%
2.	FM	1	5.9%

Reasons For Recycle

1.	P	44.4%
2.	PPR	33.3%
3.	SOR	22.2%

2014

# Attended		97	
66 Enlisted			
31 Officers			
# Grad	37	38.1%	
# Fail	60	61.9%	

Top 5 Failure

1.	LN	10	10.3%
2.	RPA	9	9.3%
2.	FM	9	9.3%
4.	P	7	7.2%
5.	MED	6	6.2%

Reasons For Recycle

1.	P	62.0%
2.	PPR	10.0%
3.	PS	8.0%
3.	SOR	8.0%
5.	PR	4.0%
5.	PRS	4.0%

2015

# Attended		57	
38 Enlisted			
19 Officers			
# Grad	14	24.6%	
# Fail	43	75.4%	

Top 5 Failure

1.	RPA	15	26.3%
2.	LN	6	10.5%
3.	P	5	8.8%
4.	FM	4	7.0%
5.	LOM	3	5.3%

Reasons For Recycle

1.	P	66.7%
2.	PS	13.3%
2.	SOR	13.3%
4.	PP	6.7%

2016

# Attended		22	
16 Enlisted			
6 Officers			
# Grad	6	27.3%	
# Fail	16	72.7%	

Top 5 Failure

1.	RPA	10	45.5%
2.	FM	5	22.7%
3.	ADM, CWSA	2	9.1%
3.	LN, LOM	2	9.1%
3.	MED	2	9.1%

Reasons For Recycle

1.	PP	42.9%
2.	P	28.6%
3.	PRS	14.3%
3.	PS	14.3%

75th Ranger Regiment
Ranger Graduation Rates

75th Ranger Regiment	GRAD	TOTAL	GRAD %
Overall	**314**	**554**	**56.7%**
Enlisted	300	528	56.8%
Officer	14	26	53.8%

# Attended		554	
528	Enlisted	26	Officers

GRAD RATE	314	56.7%
FAIL RATE	240	43.3%

RANK	GRAD	TOTAL	GRAD %
E3	88	139	63.3%
E4	203	362	56.1%
E5	6	15	40.0%
E6	2	8	25.0%
E7	1	4	25.0%
O1	5	9	55.6%
O2	4	10	40.0%
O3	5	7	71.4%

Top Five Failures*		
1. RPA	75	13.5%
2. LN	42	7.6%
3. P	38	6.9%
4. MED	27	4.9%
5. FM, SOR	12	2.2%
Reasons For Recycle**		
373		
1. P		66.5%
2. PP		8.3%
2. PS		7.5%
2. SOR		6.2%
3. PR		4.3%

*Percentage of overall # attend
**Percentages of overall # of recycles

Those percentages highlighted in
RED are below the Ranger School
FY16 Average of 36.8%.

75th Ranger Regiment Trends Ranger School Statistics

2012		
# Attended		606
588 Enlisted		
12 Officers		
# Grad	376	62.0%
# Fail	230	38.0%
Top 5 Failure		
1. LN	62	10.2%
2. FM	37	6.1%
3. MED	32	5.3%
4. P	28	4.6%
5. RPA	22	3.6%
Reasons For Recycle		
1. P		78.5%
2. SOR		6.2%
3. PPR		5.1%
3. PR		5.1%
5. MED		2.6%

2013		
# Attended		701
686 Enlisted		
15 Officers		
# Grad	336	47.9%
# Fail	365	52.1%
Top 5 Failure		
1. LN	120	17.1%
2. FM	48	6.8%
3. MED	44	6.3%
4. P	37	5.3%
4. SOR	30	4.3%
Reasons For Recycle		
1. P		60.1%
2. PR		9.8%
3. SOR		8.0%
4. PP		6.0%
5. PS		4.9%

2014		
# Attended		589
580 Enlisted		
9 Officers		
# Grad	318	54.0%
# Fail	271	46.0%
Top 5 Failure		
1. P	47	8.0%
2. FM	42	7.1%
3. MED	39	6.6%
4. RPA	37	6.3%
5. LN	33	5.6%
Reasons For Recycle		
1. P		71.4%
2. SOR		8.0%
3. PPR		5.9%
4. PS		3.5%
5. MED		3.1%

2015		
# Attended		591
565 Enlisted		
26 Officers		
# Grad	340	57.5%
# Fail	251	42.5%
Top 5 Failure		
1. RPA	78	13.2%
2. FM	33	5.6%
3. LN	32	5.4%
4. MED	31	5.2%
4. P	31	5.2%
Reasons For Recycle		
1. P		56.4%
2. PS		10.6%
3. SOR		9.0%
4. PP		8.7%
5. PR		6.7%

2016		
# Attended		554
528 Enlisted		
26 Officers		
# Grad	314	56.7%
# Fail	240	43.3%
Top 5 Failure		
1. RPA	75	13.5%
2. LN	42	7.6%
3. P	38	6.9%
4. MED	27	4.9%
4. FM, SOR	12	2.2% each
Reasons For Recycle		
1. P		66.5%
2. PP		8.3%
3. PS		7.5%
4. SOR		6.2%
5. PR		4.3%

82nd Airborne Division Ranger Graduation Rates

82nd Airborne Division	GRAD	TOTAL	GRAD %
Overall	**101**	**267**	**37.8%**
Enlisted	72	204	35.3%
Officer	29	63	46.0%

RANK	GRAD	TOTAL	GRAD %
E2	1	3	33.3%
E3	14	35	40.0%
E4	18	80	22.5%
E5	24	51	47.1%
E6	14	28	50.0%
E7	1	7	14.3%
O1	12	34	35.3%
O2	10	17	58.8%
O3	6	11	54.5%
O5	1	1	100.0%

# Attended		267	
170	Enlisted	72	Officers

GRAD RATE	101	37.8%
FAIL RATE	166	62.2%

Top Five Failures*		
1. RPA	69	25.8%
2. LN	34	12.7%
3. FM	15	5.6%
4. P	10	3.7%
5. LOM	9	3.4%

Reasons For Recycle**	
101	
1. P	58.4%
2. PP	12.9%
3. PS	10.9%
4. SOR	6.9%
5. PR	5.4%

*Percentage of overall # attend
**Percentages of overall # of recycles

Those percentages highlighted in
RED are below the Ranger School
FY16 Average of 36.8%.

82nd Airborne Division Trends Ranger School Statistics

2012		
# Attended		154
102 Enlisted		
52 Officers		
# Grad	33	35.5%
# Fail	60	64.5%
Top 5 Failure		
1. FM	12	7.8%
2. LN	11	7.1%
3. RPA	9	5.8%
4. MED	8	5.2%
5. P	5	3.2%
Reasons For Recycle		
1. P		71.4%
2. PR		9.1%
2. SOR		9.1%
4. PPR		7.8%
5. PS		1.3%
5. ADMIN		1.3%

2013		
# Attended		306
218 Enlisted		
88 Officers		
# Grad	131	42.8%
# Fail	175	57.2%
Top 5 Failure		
1. LN	65	21.2%
2. RPA	23	7.5%
3. MED	22	7.2%
4. P	18	5.9%
5. FM	14	4.6%
Reasons For Recycle		
1. P		64.3%
2. PR		9.1%
3. PPR		7.0%
4. SOR		6.3%
5. MED		4.9%

2014		
# Attended		231
158 Enlisted		
73 Officers		
# Grad	117	50.6%
# Fail	114	49.4%
Top 5 Failure		
1. RPA	36	15.6%
2. LN	17	7.4%
3. FM	15	6.5%
4. MED	10	4.3%
5. LOM, P	8	3.5%
Reasons For Recycle		
1. P		57.4%
2. PPR		12.8%
3. SOR		9.6%
4. PR		8.5%
5. PS, S		4.3%

2015		
# Attended		181
114 Enlisted		
67 Officers		
# Grad	84	19.8%
# Fail	97	80.2%
Top 5 Failure		
1. RPA	34	18.8%
2. FM	17	9.4%
3. P	10	5.5%
4. LN	9	5.0%
5. LOM	7	3.9%
Reasons For Recycle		
1. P		63.4%
2. PP		8.9%
2. SOR		8.9%
4. PS		4.0%
4. S		4.0%
4. PR		4.0%

2016		
# Attended		267
170 Enlisted		
72 Officers		
# Grad	101	37.8%
# Fail	166	62.2%
Top 5 Failure		
1. RPA	69	25.8%
2. LN	34	12.7%
3. FM	15	5.6%
4. p	10	3.7%
5. LOM	9	3.4%
Reasons For Recycle		
1. P		58.4%
2. PP		12.9%
3. PS		10.9%
4. SOR		6.9%
5. PR		5.4%

173rd Airborne Division Ranger Graduation Rates

173rd Airborne Division	GRAD	TOTAL	GRAD %
Overall	29	140	20.7%
Enlisted	24	119	20.2%
Officer	5	21	23.8%

RANK	GRAD	TOTAL	GRAD %
E3	4	18	22.2%
E4	9	37	24.3%
E5	9	34	26.5%
E6	1	24	4.2%
E7	0	4	0.0%
E8	1	2	50.0%
O1	3	11	27.3%
O2	2	10	20.0%

# Attended		140	
170	Enlisted	72	Officers

GRAD RATE	29	20.7%
FAIL RATE	111	79.3%

Top Five Failures*		
1. RPA	42	30.0%
2. LN	28	20.0%
3. FM	18	12.9%
4. MED	9	6.4%
5. P	4	2.9%

Reasons For Recycle**	
35	
1. P	45.7%
2. PP	14.3%
3. SOR	14.3%
4. PS	11.4%
5. PRS/S	5.7% each

*Percentage of overall # attend
**Percentages of overall # of recycles

Those percentages highlighted in RED are below the Ranger School FY16 Average of 36.8%.

173ʳᵈ Airborne Division Trends Ranger School Statistics

2012

# Attended		32
26 Enlisted		
6 Officers		
# Grad	9	28.1%
# Fail	23	71.9%

Top 5 Failure

1.	LN	6	18.8%
2.	RPA	5	15.6%
2.	FM	5	15.6%
4.	MED	2	6.3%
5.	ADM, CWS, LOM, P, SOR	1	3.1% each

Reasons For Recycle

1.	P	66.7%
2.	PP	16.7%
3.	SOR	16.7%

2013

# Attended		8
7 Enlisted		
1 Officers		
# Grad	1	12.5%
# Fail	7	87.5%

Top 5 Failure

1.	LN	3	37.5%
2.	FM	2	25.0%
3.	MED	1	12.5%
4.	ADMIN	1	12.5%

Reasons For Recycle

2014

# Attended		41
35 Enlisted		
6 Officers		
# Grad	17	41.5%
# Fail	24	58.5%

Top 5 Failure

1.	RPA	8	19.5%
2.	LN	5	12.2%
2.	FM	5	12.2%
4.	MED	4	9.8%
5.	P, PP	1	2.4% each

Reasons For Recycle

1.	P	50.0%
2.	PPR	33.3%
3.	SOR	11.1%
4.	PR	5.6%
4.	PPS	5.6%

2015

# Attended		85
62 Enlisted		
23 Officers		
# Grad	36	42.4%
# Fail	49	57.6%

Top 5 Failure

1.	RPA	22	25.9%
2.	LN	7	8.2%
3.	FM	5	5.9%
4.	MED	4	4.7%
5.	CWS	3	3.5%

Reasons For Recycle

1.	P	48.7%
2.	PS	17.9%
3.	PP	12.8%
3.	PR	10.3%
3.	SOR	7.7%

2016

# Attended		140
170 Enlisted		
72 Officers		
# Grad	29	20.7%
# Fail	111	79.3%

Top 5 Failure

1.	RPA	42	30.0%
2.	LN	28	20.0%
3.	FM	18	12.9%
4.	MED	9	6.4%
5.	P	4	2.9%

Reasons For Recycle

1.	P	45.7%
2.	PP	14.3%
2.	SOR	14.%
4.	PS	11.4%
5.	PRS, S	5.7% each

36

ABOLC
Ranger Graduation Rates

ABOLC	GRAD	TOTAL	GRAD %
Overall	39	178	21.9%
Officer	39	178	21.9%

# Attended		178	
0	Enlisted	178	Officers

GRAD RATE	39	21.9%
FAIL RATE	139	78.1%

RANK	GRAD	TOTAL	GRAD %
O1	39	176	22.2%
O2	0	1	0.0%
O3	0	1	0.0%

Top Five Failures*		
1. RPA	52	29.2%
2. FM	27	15.2%
3. LN	21	11.8%
4. P	16	9.0%
5. MED	9	5.1%
Reasons For Recycle**		
56		
1. P		58.9%
2. PR		10.7%
3. PS		10.7%
4. PP		8.9%
5. PRS/SOR		3.6% each

*Percentage of overall # attend
**Percentages of overall # of recycles

Those percentages highlighted in
RED are below the Ranger School
FY16 Average of 36.8%.

ABOLC Trends
Ranger School Statistics

2012

# Attended		66

66 Officers

# Grad	33	50.0%
# Fail	33	50.0%

Top 5 Failure

1.	FM	14	21.2%
2.	RPA	4	6.1%
3.	LN	3	4.5%
3.	PP	3	4.5%
3.	ADMIN	3	4.5%

Reasons For Recycle

1.	P	60.0%
2.	SOR	25.0%
3.	S	5.0%
3.	MED	5.0%
3.	PRS	5.0%

2013

# Attended		158

158 Officers

# Grad	54	34.2%
# Fail	104	65.8%

Top 5 Failure

1.	RPA	26	16.5%
1.	FM	26	16.5%
2.	MED	19	12.0%
3.	ADMIN	7	4.4%
4.	SOR	6	3.8%

Reasons For Recycle

1.	P	51.5%
2.	PR	13.6%
3.	SOR	12.1%
4.	PPR	7.6%
5.	MED	6.1%
5.	PS	6.1%

2014

# Attended		161

161 Officers

# Grad	42	26.1%
# Fail	119	73.9%

Top 5 Failure

1.	LN	22	24.7%
2.	RPA	18	20.2%
3.	FM	12	13.5%
4.	LOM	5	5.6%
5.	ADMIN, MED	3	3.4%

Reasons For Recycle

1.	P	50.0%
2.	PPR	33.3%
3.	SOR	11.1%
4.	PR	5.6%
4.	PPS	5.6%

2015

# Attended		149

149 Officers

# Grad	36	24.2%
# Fail	113	75.8%

Top 5 Failure

1.	RPA	40	26.8%
2.	FM	29	19.5%
3.	LN	16	10.7%
4.	P	7	4.7%
5.	LOM	5	3.4%

Reasons For Recycle

1.	P	57.1%
2.	PP	12.7%
3.	PS	9.5%
3.	S	6.3%
3.	SOR	4.8%

2016

# Attended		178

178 Officers

# Grad	39	21.9%
# Fail	139	78.1%

Top 5 Failure

1.	RPA	52	29.2%
2.	FM	27	15.2%
3.	LN	21	11.8%
4.	P	16	9.0%
5.	MED	9	5.1%

Reasons For Recycle

1.	P	58.9%
2.	PR	10.7%
2.	PS	10.7%
4.	PP	8.9%
5.	PRS, SOR	3.6% each

IBOLC
Ranger Graduation Rates

IBOLC	GRAD	TOTAL	GRAD %
Overall	**380**	**936**	**40.6%**
Officer	380	936	40.6%

# Attended	936	
0 Enlisted	936	Officers

RANK	GRAD	TOTAL	GRAD %
O1	377	932	40.5%
O2	3	4	75.0%

GRAD RATE	380	40.6%
FAIL RATE	556	59.4%

Top Five Failures*		
1. RPA	206	22.0%
2. LN	83	8.9%
3. P	81	8.7%
4. FM	76	8.1%
5. MED	31	3.3%
Reasons For Recycle**		
464		
1. P		59.3%
2. PP		11.9%
3. PS		6.9%
4. PR		6.7%
5. PRS		5.2%

*Percentage of overall # attend
**Percentages of overall # of recycles

Those percentages highlighted in
RED are below the Ranger School
FY16 Average of 36.8%.

IBOLC Trends
Ranger School Statistics

2012		
# Attended		1068
6 Enlisted		
1062 Officers		
# Grad	588	55.1%
# Fail	480	44.9%
Top 5 Failure		
1. LN	111	10.4%
2. RM	93	8.7%
3. RPA	83	7.8%
4. MED	40	3.7%
4. PP	39	3.7%
Reasons For Recycle		
1. P		55.3%
2. SOR		10.8%
3. PR		8.4%
4. PP		8.2%

2013		
# Attended		1020
5 Enlisted		
1015 Officers		
# Grad	490	48.0%
# Fail	530	52.0%
Top 5 Failure		
1. LN	111	10.9%
2. RPA	108	10.6%
3. FM	70	6.9%
4. MED	61	6.0%
4. P	56	5.5%
Reasons For Recycle		
1. P		56.3%
2. PR		9.2%
3. SOR		8.8%
4. PP		8.4%
5. MED		5.3%

2014		
# Attended		1079
6 Enlisted		
1073 Officers		
# Grad	484	44.9%
# Fail	595	55.1%
Top 5 Failure		
1. RPA	171	15.8%
2. P	81	7.5%
3. FM	80	7.4%
4. LN	75	7.0%
5. MED	55	5.1%
Reasons For Recycle		
1. P		67.2%
2. PP		11.9%
3. PS		6.1%
4. SOR		5.5%
5. PR		5.3%

2015		
# Attended		935
3 Enlisted		
932 Officers		
# Grad	389	41.6%
# Fail	546	58.4%
Top 5 Failure		
1. RPA	179	19.1%
2. FM	86	9.2%
3. LN	71	7.6%
3. P	71	7.6%
5. MED	39	4.2%
Reasons For Recycle		
1. P		56.2%
2. PS		9.4%
3. PP		8.3%
4. SOR		7.7%
5. PR		5.7%

2016		
# Attended		936
0 Enlisted		
936 Officers		
# Grad	380	40.6%
# Fail	556	59.4%
Top 5 Failure		
1. RPA	206	18.3%
2. LN	83	8.9%
3. P	81	8.7%
4. FM	76	8.1%
5. MED	31	3.3%
Reasons For Recycle		
1. P		59.3%
2. PP		11.9%
3. PS		6.9%
4. PR		6.7%
5. PRS		5.2%

MCCC
Ranger Graduation Rates

MCCC	GRAD	TOTAL	GRAD %
Overall	14	85	16.5%
Officer	14	85	16.5%

# Attended		85	
0	Enlisted	85	Officers

	GRAD RATE	14	16.5%
	FAIL RATE	71	83.5%

RANK	GRAD	TOTAL	GRAD %
O3	14	85	16.5%

Top Five Failures*		
1. RPA	42	49.4%
2. FM	11	12.9%
3. MED	8	9.4%
4. LN	5	5.9%
5. LOM	2	2.4%
Reasons For Recycle**		
16		
1. P		68.8%
2. PS		12.5%
3. PP		6.3%
3. PRS		6.3%
3. SOR		6.3%

*Percentage of overall # attend
**Percentages of overall # of recycles

Those percentages highlighted in
RED are below the Ranger School
FY16 Average of 36.8%.

MCCC Trends
Ranger School Statistics

2012

# Attended		66
66 Officers		
# Grad	24	21.2%
# Fail	89	78.8%
Top 5 Failure		
1. RPA	32	48.5%
2. LN	19	28.8%
3. FM	15	22.7%
3. MED	14	21.2%
Reasons For Recycle		
1. P		81.8%
2. PS		9.1%
2. PR		9.1%

2013

# Attended		158
158 Officers		
# Grad	23	22.8%
# Fail	78	77.2%
Top 5 Failure		
1. RPA	22	13.9%
2. FM	17	10.8%
2. LN	17	10.8%
4. MED	10	6.3%
5. PP	4	2.5%
Reasons For Recycle		
1. P		61.5%
2. PS		15.4%
3. PR		11.5%
4. SOR		7.7%
5. PP		3.8%

2014

# Attended		161
161 Officers		
# Grad	27	20.3%
# Fail	106	79.7%
Top 5 Failure		
1. RPA	51	31.7%
2. FM	24	14.9%
3. LN	12	7.5%
4. MED	8	5.0%
Reasons For Recycle		
1. P		45.0%
2. SOR		20.0%
3. S		10.0%
2. PP		10.0%
4. PS, PR, PPS		3.8% each

2015

# Attended		124
124 Officers		
# Grad	18	14.5%
# Fail	106	85.5%
Top 5 Failure		
1. RPA	55	44.4%
2. FM	17	13.7%
3. LN	13	10.5%
4. MED	10	8.1%
5. LOM, P	3	2.4%
Reasons For Recycle		
1. P		61.5%
2. PS		19.2%
3. PP		7.7%
3. PR		7.7%
5. MED		3.8%

2016

# Attended		85
85 Officers		
# Grad	14	16.5%
# Fail	71	83.5%
Top 5 Failure		
1. RPA	42	49.4%
2. FM	11	12.9%
3. MED	8	9.4%
4. LN	5	5.9%
5. LOM	2	2.4%
Reasons For Recycle		
1. P		68.8%
2. PS		12.5%
3. PP		6.3%
3. PRS		6.3%
3. SOR		6.3%

42

National Guard
Ranger Graduation Rates

National Guard	GRAD	TOTAL	GRAD %
Overall	39	89	43.8%
Enlisted	15	35	42.9%
Officer	24	54	44.4%

# Attended		89	
35	Enlisted	54	Officers

GRAD RATE	39	43.8%
FAIL RATE	50	56.2%

RANK	GRAD	TOTAL	GRAD %
E4	4	9	44.4%
E5	5	9	55.6%
E6	6	14	42.9%
E7	0	3	0.0%
O1	20	43	46.5%
O2	4	10	40.0%
O3	0	1	0.0%

Top Five Failures*		
1. RPA	16	18.0%
2. FM	10	11.2%
3. LN	7	7.9%
4. P	5	5.6%
5. LOM	4	4.5%

Reasons For Recycle**	
42	
1. P	59.5%
2. PP	14.3%
3. PS	9.5%
4. PRS	7.1%
5. PR	4.8%

*Percentage of overall # attend
**Percentages of overall # of recycles

Those percentages highlighted in
RED are below the Ranger School
FY16 Average of 36.8%.

National Guard Trends
Ranger School Statistics

2012

# Attended		102
35 Enlisted		
67 Officers		
# Grad	57	55.9%
# Fail	45	44.1%

Top 5 Failure

1.	FM	12	11.8%
2.	LN	11	10.8%
3.	LOM	9	8.8%
4.	MED	5	4.9%
5.	P, SOR, RPA	3	2.9%

Reasons For Recycle

1.	P	65.2%
2.	PR	17.4%
3.	SOR	6.5%
4.	ADMIN	4.3%
5.	PP, MED, PS	2.2% each

2013

# Attended		175
77 Enlisted		
98 Officers		
# Grad	75	42.9%
# Fail	100	57.1%

Top 5 Failure

1.	RPA	26	14.9%
2.	FM	18	10.3%
3.	LN	12	6.9%
4.	LOM	10	5.7%
4.	P	9	5.1%

Reasons For Recycle

1.	P	58.6%
2.	PR	15.7%
3.	PP	10.0%
3.	SOR	4.3%
5.	PS, S	2.9% each

2014

# Attended		116
58 Enlisted		
58 Officers		
# Grad	64	55.2%
# Fail	45	44.8%

Top 5 Failure

1.	LN	15	12.9%
2.	RPA	10	8.6%
3.	MED	7	6.0%
3.	P	7	6.0%
5.	FM	5	4.3%

Reasons For Recycle

1.	P	62.1%
2.	SOR	12.1%
3.	PR	8.6%
4.	MED	6.9%
4.	PP	6.9%

2015

# Attended		61
41 Enlisted		
20 Officers		
# Grad	23	
# Fail	38	

Top 5 Failure

1.	RPA	13	21.3%
2.	LN	8	13.1%
3.	FM	4	6.6%
3.	P	4	6.6%
5.	LOM	3	4.9%

Reasons For Recycle

1.	P	84.2%
2.	MED	5.3%
2.	PS	5.3%
2.	SOR	5.3%

2016

# Attended		89
35 Enlisted		
54 Officers		
# Grad	39	43.8%
# Fail	50	56.2%

Top 5 Failure

1.	RPA	16	18.0%
2.	FM	10	11.2%
3.	LN	7	7.9%
4.	P	5	5.6%
5.	LOM	4	4.5%

Reasons For Recycle

1.	P	59.5%
2.	PP	14.3%
3.	PS	9.5%
3.	PRS	7.1%
4.	PR	4.8%

USASOC
Ranger Graduation Rates

USASOC	GRAD	TOTAL	GRAD %
Overall	102	204	50.0%
Enlisted	91	175	52.0%
Officer	11	29	37.9%

# Attended		203	
175	Enlisted	29	Officers

GRAD RATE	101	49.8%
FAIL RATE	102	50.2%

RANK	GRAD	TOTAL	GRAD %
E2	1	1	100.0%
E3	2	2	100.0%
E4	35	42	83.3%
E5	40	74	54.1%
E6	11	45	24.4%
E7	1	10	10.0%
E9	1	1	100.0%
O1	1	2	50.0%
O2	2	9	22.2%
O3	8	18	44.4%

Top Five Failures*

1. RPA	43	21.2%
2. FM	19	9.4%
3. MED	12	5.9%
4. LN	11	5.4%
5. P	7	3.4%

Reasons For Recycle**

82	
1. P	64.6%
2. PP	8.5%
3. MED	6.1%
3. PR	6.1%
3. SOR	6.1%

*Percentage of overall # attend
**Percentages of overall # of recycles

Those percentages highlighted in
RED are below the Ranger School
FY16 Average of 36.8%.

USASOC Trends
Ranger School Statistics

2012		
# Attended		244
185 Enlisted		
59 Officers		
# Grad	125	51.2%
# Fail	119	48.8%
Top 5 Failure		
1. FM	31	12.7%
2. RPA	26	10.7%
3. LN	19	7.8%
4. MED	12	4.9%
5. LOM	9	3.7%
Reasons For Recycle		
1. P		63.9%
2. SOR		13.9%
3. PP		8.3%
4. PR		5.6%
4. PRS		5.6%

2013		
# Attended		160
129 Enlisted		
31 Officers		
# Grad	54	33.8%
# Fail	106	66.3%
Top 5 Failure		
1. LN	26	16.3%
2. RPA	18	11.3%
3. FM	17	10.6%
3. MED	17	10.6%
4. CWSA	8	5.0%
Reasons For Recycle		
1. P		57.1%
2. MED		11.9%
3. PR		11.9%
4. PP		7.1%
5. SOR		4.8%

2014		
# Attended		186
63 Enlisted		
23 Officers		
# Grad	67	36.0%
# Fail	119	64.0%
Top 5 Failure		
1. RPA	36	19.4%
2. FM	18	9.7%
3. MED	16	8.6%
4. LN	12	6.5%
5. LOM	10	5.4%
Reasons For Recycle		
1. P		70.9%
2. SOR		12.7%
3. PR		7.3%
4. PP		5.5%
4. PS		1.8%

2015		
# Attended		182
154 Enlisted		
28 Officers		
# Grad	79	43.4%
# Fail	103	56.6%
Top 5 Failure		
1. RPA	29	15.9%
2. LN	23	12.6%
3. FM	20	11.0%
4. MED	11	6.0%
5. P	6	3.3%
Reasons For Recycle		
1. P		75.5%
2. PS		8.2%
3. SOR		6.1%
4. PP		4.1%
5. ADM, MED, PR		2.0% each

2016		
# Attended		203
175 Enlisted		
29 Officers		
# Grad	101	49.8%
# Fail	102	50.2%
Top 5 Failure		
1. RPA	43	21.2%
2. FM	19	9.4%
3. MED	12	5.9%
4. LN	11	5.4%
4. P	7	3.4%
Reasons For Recycle		
1. P		64.6%
2. PP		8.5%
3. MED		6.1%
3. PR		6.1%
3. SOR		6.1%